



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/519,547 03/06/00 TRIEPELS

J PHN 17,327

EXAMINER

MMC2/0222

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

NGUYEN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED:

02/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/519,547

Applicant(s)
Tripels et al

Examiner
Truc Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2833



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 19, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-10 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-10 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: : 2833

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117).

Regarding claims 1-2, Lazzery discloses a display device (20) comprising a first substrate (90) having conductor pattern (106) and electrically conducting connections (24) between the pattern and conducting tracks (40) on a support (12), said conducting connection comprising a resilient connection (70) which provides a variable-pressure metal-metal contact such as copper clad gold.

Lazzery does not specifically disclose the metal-metal contact is a chosen from the group of gold, silver and nickel. Lazzery only disclose the metal-metal contact is made by copper clad gold. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a gold material into Lazzery's contacts for good conductivity. Since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known

Art Unit: : 2833

material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 3, Lazzery discloses the metal-metal contact is present at the area of the first substrate.

Regarding claim 6, Lazzery discloses the conductor pattern on the first substrate faces the support.

Regarding claim 8, Lazzery discloses the display device comprises a second substrate (92) opposite from part of the first substrate (90) and an electro-optical material (93) between the two substrates, each being provided with substrate electrodes (94) which define pixels with the electro-optical material, the first substrate being provided with the conductor pattern beyond the part of the first substrate located opposite the second substrate.

Regarding claim 10, Lazzery discloses a part of the conductor pattern is connected in an electrically conducting manner to a conducting track on the side of the support remote from the first substrate.

3. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiramoto et al (US 5,847,783).

Lazzery substantially discloses the claimed invention except the conducting connection between the resilient conductor and the conductor pattern comprises an anisotropically conducting foil.

Art Unit: : 2833

Hiramoto et al discloses an anisotropic conductive adhesive (20) is used in the liquid display (column 4, lines 20-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an anisotropic material into Lazzery's conducting connection, as taught by Hiramoto et al for electrically conducting purpose.

Regarding claim 9, Lazzery discloses Lazzery substantially discloses the claimed invention except the display device comprises an electroluminescent material.

Hiramoto et al discloses an electroluminescent layer (15c) is used in the liquid display (column 4, lines 9-13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an electroluminescent material into Lazzery's liquid display, as taught by Hiramoto et al providing self emitting light to the display.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Iguchi (US 5,233,451).

Lazzery substantially discloses the claimed invention except the electrically conducting connection comprising a conducting part which encloses the edge of the first substrate.

Iguchi disclose a conducting element (23) which encloses the edge of the substrate (16) for used in a liquid display.

Art Unit: : 2833

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a conducting element encloses the edge of Lazzery's first substrate, as taught by Iguchi for better electrical connection.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/27/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Because:

Regarding to applicant's arguments:

(1) *"it is the applicant's understanding that Lazzery does not recite or suggest a display device where at least one conducting connection is a resilient connection that provides a variable-pressure metal-metal contact,"*

(2) *"consequently, Lazzery lacks the advantage of added contact...Applicant's claimed invention eliminates the need for such stop...and take advantage of the pressure clamping provides."*

The examiner is respectfully disagrees.

Regarding (1), Lazzery clearly disclose (column 2 lines 49-50) at least one conducting connection (24) comprising an resilient connetion (70) made by resilient such as rubber. Rubber provides a variable pressure when a force is applied onto it.

Art Unit: : 2833

Regarding (2), applicant has disclosed nothing that would preclude the use of a stop in the device.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-4004. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: : 2833

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Austin Bradley, can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

T. Nguyen - February 15, 2001.

P. Bradley